DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 957 CE 066 315

AUTHOR	Burt, Miriam
TITLE	The Cafeteria Workers' Skills Enhancement Training Program. Performance Report.
INSTITUTION	Food and Beverage Workers Union, Local 32, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC. National Workplace Literacy Program.
PUB DATE	30 Apr 94
CONTRACT	V19820036
NOTE	22p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Federal Government; *Food Service; *Government Employees; High School Equivalency Programs; *Labor Education; *Literacy Education; Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; Unions
IDENTIFIERS	Food and Beverage Workers Union; *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

A program was conducted by the Food and Beverage Workers Union in Washington, D.C., to provide workplace literacy classes for food service workers in the city's government agencies, universities, and museums. A curriculum for workplace literacy skills was developed, sites were selected, and students were recruited. From a target audience of approximately 3,000 workers, 209 workers enrolled in the series of classes during the 22 months of the project. A total of 27 classes were offered on a flexible schedule, with at least 60 hours offered for each session. Most classes were scheduled twice a week for 4 hours weekly. Classes were offered in basic skills, pre-General Educational Development (GED) Test, GED test preparation, workplace communications, English as a second language, and a sampler of communications, mathematics, and writing. A total of 215 students attended at least 8 hours in each class, and 73 received certificates for completing at least 80 percent of 2 classes. At the end of the program, the program director recommended that a method be established to encourage employers to help workers to use their new skills on the job and that computers be incorporated into the program. Information about the program was disseminated at 32 conferences. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 957

Performance Report

of

The Cafeteria Workers'
SKILLS ENHANCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

a project of

THE FOOD AND BEVERAGE WORKERS UNION LOCAL 32 & EMPLOYERS BENEFITS FUND

submitted to the
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
U.S. Department of Education

Prepared by:

MIRIAM BURT
PROJECT DIRECTOR
AWARD NUMBER: V19820036

April 30, 1994

CE 066 315

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERFORMANCE REPORT

Introduction

The Food and Beverage Workers Union Local 32 & Employers Benefits Fund (hereafter referred to as "the Fund") was awarded a grant in April 1992 by the U.S. Department of Education under the National Workplace Literacy Program. This grant, the second received by the Fund, served to continue and expand the Skills Enhancement Training Program (SET). SET's objective was to continue to provide workplace literacy instruction to the unionized cafeteria workers in the Washington D.C. area. As had been the case with the earlier grant, the employee benefits fund that received the grant served as the project's workplace partner. That joint entity was governed by labor and management trustees representing the cafeteria workers' union and the companies for which they worked. The education partner was the Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI) of the AFL-CIO. Ruttenberg, Kilgallon and Associates and COSMOS Corporation served as subcontractors to the project, providing technical assistance and evaluation services.

The mission statement of this project was: "to expand this innovative model for a fully workplace-based approach to adult literacy, building on successes under a prior grant, refining and expanding the classroom curriculum, adding sites, extending the evaluation of impact on individuals and their workplaces, and moving toward full private sector support."

As in the prior grant, a majority of the workers served were minority and female; many were single parents of young and teen-age children. They were the cashiers, cooks, salad makers, line servers, utility workers, stockroom attendants, and waiters and waitresses who provide food service to university students, to Smithsonian tourists, and to government workers throughout the Washington D.C. metropolitan area. Under this grant, SET expanded to Richmond, Virginia to include the ARA Company food and beverage workers at the Philip Morris plant there.

This performance report presents a summary of the project's activities. It contains five sections. In the first, the program is described briefly. In the second, the actual accomplishments of the program are compared to the objectives from the approved proposal. In the third, required statistical data is listed. In the fourth, key personnel changes and their impact on the program are described. In the fifth and final section, the program staff makes recommendations to the Department of Education. At the end of the report is an inclusive list of all project dissemination activities to date. The project's evaluation report, which was prepared by the subcontractors, COSMOS Corporation and Ruttenberg, Kilgallon & Associates, will be submitted separately.

I. Brief Description of the Program

The targeted cafeteria workers were the nearly 3000 unionized employees of food service contractors at the U.S. Capitol, Pentagon, Smithsonian, and some 60 other Washington agencies, institutions, and universities. This number also includes the cafeteria workers at the Philip Morris plant in Richmond, Virginia.

The services these workers were offered by the SET program included educational counseling, testing, tutoring, workshop presentations on selected workplace topics, basic skills classes, pre-GED and GED Instruction, English as a second Language (ESL) classes, and Workplace Communications classes. All participants were self-selected and all attended classes on their own time.

While it is true that a majority of the cafeteria workers had a Monday through Friday work schedule and were at their jobs between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., a large group worked at Universities, or at Smithsonian Museums on weekends and into the evening. Still others had second jobs or babysitting problems which kept them from participating in classes offered immediately after work. For this reason, classes were scheduled at a wide variety of times to offer the most flexibility to workers with their varied schedules. Classes were held, after work, from 3:30 p.m.- 5:30 p.m., or from 4:30 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.; or in the evening, from 6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.; or on Saturdays, from 9:30 a.m. -12:30 p.m., 9:30 a.m. - 1:30 p.m. or from 1:00 p.m.- 3:00 p.m. During the summer of 1993, a class was held from 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Classes were held at the Union office and at work sites which were accessible by metro or bus for those participants who came from other work sites.

The program structure consisted of four full cycles of instruction. Initially, in an attempt to offer at least 60 hours of instruction, and following the practice of classes held under a prior grant, most classes were scheduled twice a week for four hours weekly for 18 weeks, or once a week for three hours weekly for 24 weeks. Increasingly, however, SET deviated from this schedule and the number of hours offered per class ranged from 28 to 78 depending on type of class offered. For example, Pre-GED and GED classes required nearly 100 hours to teach the reading, writing, math, science, and social studies skills needed to pass the graduate equivalency exam. On the other hand, the Workplace Communications class was able to offer instruction in problem-solving and conflict resolution in 24 hours of class time. Additionally, shorter pilot classes for each new courses offered this grant period, (ESL, Pre-GED, GED, and Workplace Communications) were given initially before running full classes.

The length of the grant was 22 months, from April of 1992 through January of 1994. Classes were held in all but the first month of the grant. Instruction periods for the cycles overlapped: the first cycle began in May 1992 and extended into November of 1992, the second cycle began in November of 1992 and extended through June of 1993, the third cycle began in April of 1993 and extended into August of 1993, and the fourth

cycle began in July of 1993 and extended through January of 1994.

Under the prior grant, workplace literacy was defined as the reading, math, writing, and "hospitality" skills needed on the job. The hospitality component of that earlier program had included competencies dealing with problem-solving and communication with one's colleagues, supervisors, and customers. This component continued in the new project in the basic skills, the so-called "SET 1" class. In this second grant, however, SET moved beyond SET 1 to include courses in ESL, in pre-GED, in GED, and in Workplace Communications (SET 2). The project also offered a shortened course called the "Campus Sampler" to University workers during their summer layoff or reduced schedule. The "sampler course" included workshops in workplace math, conflict resolution on the job, and writing. In Richmond, at the ARA cafeteria at the Philip Morris plant, a workshop series was offered which included team building, conflict resolution, and writing. All participants at all sites had the opportunity to attend the learning center for two hours per week for additional computer-aided practice with material learned in class.

A total of 27 classes were offered over the period of the grant. This included all tutorials, sampler classes, and the workshop series. A total of 209 people were enrolled in the program. Seventy-three of this number received certificates at the Graduation ceremony held on September 21, 1993, at the Rayburn Building. These participants had completed at least 80% of two classes and were eligible to receive a $200 training incentive bonus from their employers. And, in November, 1993, a graduation ceremony was held at with the ARA company to honor those participants who had completed the workshop series there.

Some teachers from the first grant were retained, and new teachers were recruited from local adult education programs. Meetings and trainings for the teachers both individually and as a group were held twice a month throughout the duration of the program. Eleven teachers participated in the program. All worked on a part-time basis. The full-time staff; including the SET Program Director,the Assistant Director, and the Learning Center Coordinator; wrote the curriculum, conducted teacher training, recruited and counseled learners, taught pilot classes, and administered the grant on a day-to-day basis under the oversight of the joint fund that served as the workplace partner.

In September of 1993, SET applied for and received a four-month, no-cost extension. This extension allowed the program to offer a full cycle of five additional classes.

II. Actual Accomplishments

The proposal listed 20 objectives which have been grouped here under the general categories of curriculum development, assessment, recruitment and counseling services, teacher training, delivery of instruction, demonstration of partnership, and project dissemination. This section of the report will describe how each objective was met in

each of those categories; it will also explain the reasons for any variance which occurred.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

- **Objective**: *Design/Refine workplace literacy curriculum for cafeteria workers employed by private for-profit food service companies in Washington area and Richmond*

During the first three months of the project, a pilot class was offered. In this class, new materials/methods were tested and the input of the participants was solicited in written and in oral form. From this pilot class, it was determined that the basic skills curriculum of the first grant was not sufficient to answer the needs of the workforce. As in the previous grant, the input of the companies was also sought through phone and personal interviews. In the prior grant,"realia" such as recipe cards, time cards, personnel manuals, and union contracts had been collected and utilized in lessons combining the reading, writing, math, and hospitality competencies of the SET 1 curriculum. In this new grant, these materials also served to form the content of the new classes: the Pre-GED, GED, ESL, and SET 2 classes which were then offered throughout the rest of the grant period. In the SET 1 class, the time card might serve as the content for a lesson on math, in ESL, it might serve as a vehicle for practicing vocabulary and grammar needed on the job, in SET 2, it might serve to pose a problem in a role play on conflict on the job. As before, staff collected these materials during numerous meetings and interviews with workers and with company personnel.

A lengthy task analysis process had been undertaken during the first grant period. For this new project it was sufficient initially (except in Richmond, a new site) to update the task analyses through a few brief workplace visits and then to periodically visit sites to remain current in the skills and issues needing to be addressed in the workplace classes. For all the classes, both the "old" SET 1 and the new classes listed above, it was deemed especially important to include content in the curricula concerning the hospitality skills used. For the ESL curriculum, a new task analysis was undertaken. Here the Director called upon her facility in Spanish to ascertain their language needs through observing and interviewing the Hispanic workers. The curriculum developed for the ESL class dealt almost exclusively with the listening and speaking skills needed for the workers to communicate with their co-workers, with their supervisors, and with the customers. As in the first grant, there was agreement among all interviewed, employers and employees, that the communication skills were of paramount importance, and that good communication with the customer was a goal all shared. This was true for even the ESL participants, who often, due to limited language ability, had "back of the house" jobs which kept them from interfacing with customers. As in the first grant, the program sought to improve the skills of all the participants to enable them to move up into "front of the house" jobs which usually paid more and afforded more status.

A review of training curricula in the industry showed that communication skills were not being addressed at a basic level. During this grant period, ongoing curriculum revision was carried out to develop materials to best meet the needs of this workforce.

In Richmond, a complete task analysis involving interviewing and observation of workers, meeting with front-line supervisors, and meeting with regional managers was done. This process led to the development of an "abbreviated workplace communications" curriculum in which one-time workshops were given in topics such as teambuilding, and conflict resolution. And in Richmond something new was done when focus group meeting of both frontline managers and workers was held in addition to the usual separate meetings.

ASSESSMENT

- **Objective:** *Refine assessment instruments for screening and pre/post measures.*

- **Objective:** *Assess results and make recommendations for future workplace literacy training.*

During the prior grant period, SET had utilized a system of performance-based assessment measures tailored to the literacy skills used in the cafeteria jobs. This system included the use of existing instruments, as well as applied performance assessment instruments developed specifically for the program. During this grant period, additional assessment instruments were developed to complete the set of performance-based pre- and post-tests.

As in the past, the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) Employment Competency System (ECS) was used to pre- and post-test the participants. CASAS/ECS was chosen because it was performance-based, workplace-related, and free of cultural bias. This system consisted of an appraisal test, pre-tests, and post-tests. The appraisal test was given to each student during the intake process and served to give a general picture of the student's level in reading and math. The teacher-administrated pre-test was given to the student during the first week of the class. The skill level of the student, as diagnosed from the appraisal test, determined which of the three pre-tests he would take. The pre-tests focused more specifically on workplace-related reading and math competencies at the skill level into which the learner tested. Finally, at the end of the course, each student was tested on the same competencies in a CASAS/ECS post test. The ESL workplace CASAS test was also given during this grant period. This system included an appraisal test with listening, reading, writing, and oral items. Then, from the appraisal scores, the appropriate pre- and post-tests were given in listening and

in reading.

Since the program had diversified to also include Pre-GED, GED, and Workplace Communications classes, the CASAS test was not sufficient for assessing gains. Also utilized were pre- and post-tests taken from the supplemental commercial class texts used in teaching the subject areas of Pre GED reading, science, writing, and math. In the GED classes, official practice tests were also given at the beginning and at the end of a course to determine if the participant was ready to take the GED exam.

The basic skills SET curriculum included both CASAS/ECS competencies and workplace competencies (identified through the task analyses) not covered by the CASAS/ECS system. Performance-based instruments were therefore developed to assess competencies in the workplace hospitality skills and the workplace problem-solving skills, as well as in some workplace reading and writing skills. As described above, new performance measurements were developed so that there could be both pre- and post-testing in the areas not covered by the CASAS system.

Program evaluation was accomplished through post-class and post-program interviews with participants, with teachers, and with participating employers. The Director did most of the pre- and all of the post-interviews with the participants. Additionally, the external evaluators did post-interviews with a cross sampling of the students, including some who had been with the program for several different cycles and some who had been with the program since the first grant period. Their findings are reported in their evaluation report of the project.

The SET staff used the data that it collected during the program for internal management of the project. For example, interviews with members of the pilot class led to the creation of the additional classes. Other changes included more aggressive dissemination of information to the companies involved in the project and more overt and deliberate linking to the workplace of all skills being taught. Yet another change was the variety in the number of hours required for each class.

The evaluators' report discusses, in depth, the data received from all the assessment and evaluation activities and makes recommendations for future projects.

RECRUITMENT/COUNSELING

- **Objective:** *Recruit workers from participating companies.*

- **Objective:** *Select and enroll workers into the workplace literacy program*

- **Objective:** *Provide group counseling on education needs and goals*

- **Objective:** *Provide educational and occupational counseling to all learners*

- **Objective:** *Provide follow-up counseling after completion of training*

- **Objective:** *Provide childcare and transportation assistance if needed.*

- **Objective:** *Refer workers to community resources for other supportive services, education, or training.*

The recruitment process was on-going; it was integrated into all aspects of the work done by the SET staff. Recruitment took place during focus group meetings, during tasks analyses and interviewing of members, as well as during recruitment meetings set up with potential program participants. Similarly, educational and career counseling was part of the recruitment process. For this reason, the recruitment and counseling objectives have been grouped together for discussion here.

Although recruitment efforts were still coordinated by the Assistant Director, and SET continued to benefit from the relationship the Assistant Director, a former business agent, had with Union members and with the companies; the survival of SET was no longer dependent on this relationship. Other players became more involved with recruitment. The Director, coming into this grant with had two years experience with the Union, the companies, and the workers, was able to use this familiarity to meet with students and with the companies herself at the Union or at the workplace. Other recruiting was undertaken by union shop stewards and business agents who posted flyers and who facilitated meetings with the workers and the companies. At these meetings the Director or the Assistant Director would speak with the workers as a group informing them about the program and signing up participants right there. These meetings were especially useful if attended by the supervisors or managers: this sent a message to the worker that SET was supported by both the union and the companies. Other recruitment took place during the bi-monthly Union meetings. SET staff always attended and made presentations at these meetings. Some of the companies were also active in the recruitment process on their own. They sent out flyers announcing the classes and encouraged employees to join.

The staff involvement and the personal attention given to recruitment continued in the intake process. SET staff did oral interviews with each prospective student. Questions asked during the interview included reasons for choosing to participate in the program, benefits hoped to be gained from the program, perceived literacy needs related

to the job, family support for the enrollment, and special interests of the applicant. As the Director spoke Spanish, this was useful during the interviews with low-level English speakers where the goal was to get the information from the applicants, not to test their English language ability.

The applicants were given the opportunity to demonstrate their listening, reading, math and writing skills at the intake testing which accompanied the interviews. Intake testing included paragraph writing and the CASAS appraisal test of math and reading (or reading and listening for the ESL student). Initially, all appraisal testing and interviewing was done by the Director or Assistant Director. Then, in the classroom, within the first two weeks, the teacher followed up with the CASAS pre-tests and the performance-based assessments. However, the work and time involved in this lengthy intake process became prohibitive for the staff to handle on their own. With the staff occupied developing curricula for the new classes and traveling to Richmond to offer the workshop classes there as the program expanded, it became impossible for the full-time staff to complete the whole intake process for each student individually, in the Union office, before each cycle began. Also, it was felt the teachers needed to be more involved with this intake process in order to better meet the instructional needs of their students. Therefore, by the fourth cycle, the teachers were performing the intake interviews and giving the appraisal tests as well as the pre- and post-tests.

The instructors provided educational counseling services as they discussed the individual learning plan, (ILP), with each individual participant. The original ILP's, developed during the first grant period, had included a listing of the competencies of the program and a section for the teachers to comment on the students progress in each of the competencies. This ILP was revised for this grant period to develop separate forms for the SET 2, ESL, Pre-GED, GED, and SET 1 classes. Another change in the ILP's included the addition of a section for the instructor and/or the full-time staff to make written recommendations for the participant's future education and training. The goals of each participant, both short term for the period of the class and long term for future education, were discussed in regularly-scheduled meetings between the teacher and the student to assess each individual's progress on his learning plan.

The situation of an applicant "testing out" of the program did not occur during this grant, for, if an applicant demonstrated reading, math, writing, or listening skills beyond the level of the ESL, SET I, or Pre-GED and GED curricula, the applicant could join the Workplace Communications class which had no ceiling on basic skill level. If participants wished to access a vocational program outside of SET, or, if their schedules did not permit him to take the appropriate SET class, they received educational counseling by the staff on outside programs which could be of benefit. Referrals were made to GED programs and business schools. Similarly, at the end of a course of study, all participants received educational counseling to further their occupational and educational goals. At times participants would be advised to continue in the program, at other times they would be advised to access professional technical schools in the area.

An initiative of the National Workplace Literacy Program (NWLP) was that the participants would upgrade their positions through the enhancement of their literacy skills. In compliance with this initiative, SET counseled the participants who, through these classes, were upgrading their literacy skills to meet the qualifications necessary for advancement, to apply for these promotions when they became available. At least two of participants were promoted due, in part, to completion of SET classes.

Scheduling classes after work, in the evening or on Saturday mornings and afternoon at convenient sites and at the Union office eliminated the need for most of the childcare and transportation funds. This ability to be flexible with scheduling of the classes was due to the pre-existing relationship of the Union and the companies. An illustration of the advantages of this relationship is the fact that many of the classes were scheduled from 4:30 p.m.- 6:30 p.m., after work hours both participants and for most company supervisors. It was necessary, at times, for the employers to pay a supervisor to stay overtime at the worksites where classes were being held in order to keep the cafeterias open. Demonstrating their support of the program, the companies would pay the supervisor to stay late so that the classes could be held at that site.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT/DEVELOPMENT

- **Objective**: *Develop "train the trainers course."*

- **Objective:** *Identify, recruit, & train instructors.*

Three teachers from the first grant were retained. Additional teachers were recruited through word of mouth, through advertisement, and through phone calls to adult basic education and English as a Second Language institutions. As workplace literacy is still a relatively new field, there were very few teacher candidates with prior experience. Qualifications for instructional staff included previous experience with adult basic education programs, preferably in non-traditional settings. After extensive interviewing and telephone reference checks, selection was made. As important as the instructional skills of the teachers was their flexibility. On a "micro-scale" flexibility meant being able to teach in the corner of a cafeteria, with or without a blackboard, to set up the class themselves and to move to another space with little or no notice when necessary. On the larger scale instructors needed to be able to see the transferability of basic and communications skills to skills needed on the workplace and they needed to be able to transmit this to the participants.

Initial teacher training included worksite visits where the instructor were given a tour of the cafeterias, observed the workers briefly, and met with company personnel. Other pre-training included an introduction to the Fund and an explanation of its embodiment of the partnership. As the project was housed in the Union, and as meetings were held there, the "union culture" training was on-going. Finally, pre-service workshops

were given in the administration of CASAS/ECS assessment instrument and in the theory of competency-based education. Generally, two-hour group training sessions were held twice a month. However, some longer trainings were given on topics such as the "interactive classroom." Other on-going training topics included the preparation of lesson plans, using the newspaper, cooperative learning, group work, and many sessions where the instructors themselves demonstrated activities and materials they used in the classroom. In addition to these semi-monthly trainings, the Program Director met bi-monthly with the individual teachers. This was necessary because the variety of classes being taught left some issues better dealt with on an individual basis. At these meetings, in addition to discussing the specific needs of a specific class, the Director discussed the results of her classroom observations with the teachers and solicited their feedback on the program.

An analysis of the teacher training and recruitment process is presented in the evaluators' report.

INSTRUCTION

- **Objective:** *Provide job-specific adult basic education*
- **Objective:** *Provide additional instruction to enhance life skills*
- **Objective:** *Provide ESL workplace literacy instruction*
- **Objective**: *Provide Pre-GED workplace literacy instruction*

All of the above objectives were met through the variety of classes offered. SET 1 offered instruction in reading, writing, math, and hospitality skills needed at the worksite. SET 2, Workplace Communications,focused on the additional skills needed at the workplace and elsewhere: problem-solving, team building, and conflict resolution. ESL classes were offered to meet the communication needs of the non-native worker. Pre-GED and GED instruction were given to those participants wanting to get a high school diploma to be promoted at the worksite. Although a high school diploma was not needed to retain a job, often promotion to higher level positions such as first cook required one. During the course of the grant, three participants received their GED certificates. Additionally, tutorial classes, instruction at the pre-basic skill level was also offered. In the tutorial class, participants who had difficulty reading, writing, and doing math at the most basic level, were taught in classes of no more than four or five.

The curriculum was developed from the extensive observation and interviews done at the worksite. Actual materials from the workplace were used to teach basic skills of reading, writing, math, and communications. All classes did not offer the minimum of 50

instructional hours required to effect change in the proficiency level of just one skill. For this reason, it was decided that participants needed to complete 80% of at least two classes before they could receive a certificate and the $200 bonus donated by the companies at the graduation ceremony.

Although there were ESL classes, non-native students who scored in the high "C" range of the CASAS test were scheduled into the Workplace Communications classes and the Pre-GED classes if they desired. It was found that both the native speakers and the ESL students benefitted from the exchange of cultural information and ideas, especially in the Workplace Communications class. And, of course, as native and non-native speakers of English worked together on a daily basis, their integration in these classes to discuss workplace communication was useful.

DEMONSTRATION OF PARTNERSHIP

- **Objective:** *Develop/expand support from company and union officials, supervisors, and union shop stewards.*

- **Objective:** *Institutionalize workplace literacy training for cafeteria workers in participating firms.*

The recipient of the grant was in itself a successful demonstration of partnership. It was the Food and Beverage Workers Union Local 32 & Employers Benefits Fund. This group was a pre-existing mechanism which had been created to manage the monies for the negotiated health, welfare, and education benefits for the Union members. The trustees of the Fund included Union representatives and employer representatives from the 18 participating companies. These companies included ARA Food Service; B & B Caterers; Canteen Corporation; DAKA International; FAME Corporation; Good Food Service; Guest Services, Inc.; Harbor Square Condominiums; Marriott Corporation; Morrisons Custom Management, Inc.; Ogden Food Service; Refractory Cafe, Ltd., at Government Printing Office; Seilers Dining Service; Service America Corporation; Servicemaster; U.S. House of Representatives Restaurant System; Woods Company; and 1900 Half Steet & 2100 2nd Street Corporations.

The Program Director, the Assistant Director, the Learning Center Coordinator, and the instructors were employees of this partnership, this Fund. The Director and the Assistant Director met quarterly with the trustees of the Fund and, as needed, with a subcommittee of the Fund consisting of a Union official: the chairman of the board; and a company official: the secretary-treasurer of the board. These Fund meetings provided a time and place to for SET to disseminate information to the participating companies, to discuss issues affecting both the Union and the companies, and to receive guidance and approval on the best direction for the program.

As was discussed in the section on recruitment, under the guidance of the full-time staff, Union shop stewards were actively involved in recruitment of participants. During their monthly meetings, shop stewards received up-to-date information on the project. When information needed to be disseminated with short notice, SET staff accessed existing Union networks to call on shop stewards to get the information out to the membership.

Also actively involved in the recruitment were the Union business agents. With the Director and/or the Assistant Director these Union officials facilitated formal meetings with workers and with the companies at the worksite, disseminated information about the program, and served as a general conduit between the worksite and SET. This was a change from the first grant period when the business agents had played a lesser role in the recruitment and in the partnership demonstration and SET staff had handled recruitment through smaller, informal meetings with individuals or small groups of workers during their work breaks or at the Union office.

Supervisors were kept current on the program from information given them by their companies. Additionally, SET staff spoke with the line supervisors of the participants during recruitment efforts and frequently by phone, especially when "trouble-shooting," when asking for temporary schedule changes so that the worker could attend classes, or when trying to arrange classes. This gave the participating companies the opportunity to speak directly to program staff and to exchange materials and information on the training and its impact on the workplace. Together with the Fund board meetings, these end-of-cycle sessions provided a forum for the program to make suggestions to the employers on simplification of company materials and procedures. Also, in September, 1992, a formal orientation to SET was held with teachers, frontline managers, regional managers, and Union officials attending. SET staff and the evaluators led the meeting describing the results of the first project and highlighting the new features of this second grant.

Toward the end of the grant period, SET staff, the Union president, and managers from three of the larger companies, ARA, GSI, and Service America were discussing ways of making attendance at Communications classes a requirement for promotion to certain job classifications and a vehicle to remove negative "write-ups" in the workers' files. In other words, attempts were being made to write SET into in the employer and union contracts. As part of this process, separate focus groups meetings were held with workers, with frontline managers, and with the regional managers of the three individual companies to assess needs and plan the content of these Communications classes. SET is now operating under yet another Department of Education NWLP grant and this institutionalization of the program through the collective bargaining system will continue to be explored.

The partnership demonstration will be discussed in more detail in the attached evaluators' report.

DISSEMINATION

- **Objective**: *Disseminate findings to other companies and unions nationally.*

- **Objective:** *Develop guidelines and other materials to aid dissemination*

Once again, the program had a large amount of dissemination. This was due, in part, to SET's educational partner, HRDI, which arranged for SET staff to participate in its ongoing technical assistance activities for projects across the nation. It was also due to connections with the AFL-CIO's Education Department. Yet another reasons was the outside evaluators who helped establish dissemination through their national linkages in the fields of training and education. Finally, it was due to the fact that the program, having participated in a national workplace literacy project, and having been named a model program in the U.S. Department of Education publication, Workplace Literacy: Reshaping the American Workforce, was becoming relatively well known in the field of workplace literacy.

Although SET staff participated in numerous conferences and gave presentations on starting up programs, building effective partnerships, and getting workers involved at all stages of the program, no formal guide was written. This omission was due to the amount of work required to expand the program from one base, Washington, and one class, SET I, to two bases, Washington and Richmond, and five classes SET I, Workplace Communications, ESL, Pre-GED, and GED. The written guide and training module are worthy projects and point to a direction the program should take as it continues into its third grant period.

In summary, SET staff gave numerous presentations, participated in work groups and on advisory boards, and read proposals. A complete list of the dissemination activities follows this report.

III. Statistical Summary

Attached is the required National Workplace Literacy Program Information form. The form gives statistical information on the program and on the participants. The evaluators' report will discuss the significance of the data.

IV. KEY PERSONNEL CHANGES

There were no changes in key staff personnel throughout the duration of the grant. However, it should be noted here that the Director was out on maternity leave for the final nine weeks of 1992. During this time, the program was administered by the Assistant Director.

V. THE PROGRAM'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on her experience setting up and administering a NWLP demonstration project for twenty-one months during the first grant, and twenty-two months during the second grant, the Director has the following recommendations to the Department of Education for future demonstrational workplace literacy grants:

- **Accountability to the Companies and Union**

In the National Workplace Literacy Program, attempts are being made to make the workplace projects more accountable through requiring a demonstration of gains in worker productivity or improved workplace performance. However, there has been little done to require a similar demonstration of the companies' efforts to give the workers opportunities on the job to use the new skills. Learning gains can be lost when they are not practiced. It is recommended that the National Workplace Literacy Program also evaluate employer's attempts to provide a venue at the workplace for workers to use the newly acquired skills.

- **Encouragement of the Use of Technology in Training**

The value of technology as a teaching tool has recently been highlighted in reports and studies. Many workplaces, among them cafeterias, are moving towards the use of more technology, including computerized menu planning and stock inventory. Given those two trends, it is recommended that the Department of Education relax their strictures against the teaching of even the most basic computer skills in these workplace literacy programs. Computer skills are arguably becoming basic skills.

DISSEMINATION LIST

Conference Presentations

Staff made presentations at the following conferences:

MAY 1992:	HRDI Regional Conference, Baltimore, MD
MAY 1992:	U.S. Department of Education Conference for Grant Start-up, Arlington, VA
JUN 1992:	HRDI National Conference, Chicago, IL
JUN 1992:	Montana State AFL-CIO Convention, Billings, MT
AUG 1992:	Virginia Adult Institute for Lifelong Learning, (VAILL), Arlington, VA
AUG 1992:	Virginia State AFL-CIO Convention, Williamsburg, VA
SEP 1992:	Oregon AFL-CIO and Labor's Community Service Agency, Portland, OR
OCT 1992:	Work in America Institute, Inc., New York, NY
OCT 1992:	United Brotherhood of Carpenters National Apprenticeship Conference, Detroit, MI
NOV 1992:	United Steelworkers of America, Local 8031, Grand Junction, CO
NOV 1992:	Association of Community-Based Education (ACBE) 17th Annual Conference, Washington, DC
DEC 1992:	Virginia State AFL-CIO Community Services Conference, Fredericksburg, VA
JAN 1993:	A. Philip Randolph Institute Regional Education Conference, Denver, CO
FEB 1993:	Points of Light Foundation, Howard University, Washington, DC
FEB 1993:	A. Philip Randolph Institute Regional Education Conference, Atlantic City, NJ
FEB 1993:	Indiana State AFL-CIO Labor Institute for Training Annual Employment and Training Conference, Indianapolis, IN

MAR 1993:	A. Philip Randolph Institute Regional Education Conference, Birmingham, AL
MAR 1993:	Delaware Association for Adult and Continuing Education Conference, Dewey Beach, DE
MAR 1993:	A. Philip Randolph Institute Regional Education Conference, Wichita, KS
MAY 1993:	New York State AFL-CIO, Albany, NY
JUN 1993:	California Labor Federation Employment and Training Conference, San Francisco, CA
JUL 1993:	Rhode Island AFL-CIO State Conference, Providence, RI
SEP 1993:	Fourth National Adult Literacy Congress, Washington, DC
SEP 1993:	National Governor's Association Conference on Worker Adjustment Services, Chicago, IL
SEP 1993:	Oregon AFL-CIO Conference, Portland, OR
NOV 1993:	Pennsylvania AFL-CIO Meetings, Harrisburg, Bethlehem, and Pittsburgh
NOV 1993:	United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America National Apprenticeship Conference, Minneapolis, MN
NOV 1993:	Coalition of Labor Union Women National Convention, Las Vegas, NV
DEC 1993:	Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI) National Conference, Miami Beach, FL
JAN 1994:	Connecticut State Afl-CIO, Hartford, CT
FEB 1994:	International Reading Association Conference, Washington, DC
MAR 1994:	Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) International Convention, Baltimore, MD

Advisory Groups

Staff participated in the following advisory groups:

• APR 1992: Read proposals at U.S. Department of Education to select programs to receive Secretary's Award for outstanding adult education program

• DEC 1992/JUN 1993: Participated in advisory panel at American Institutes for Research for U.S./U.S. Department of Education-OERI project to write manual to help small businesses access training, Washington, DC

• APR 1993: U.S. Department of Education: meeting to discuss evaluating the success of the National Workplace Literacy Program

Publications About the Program

The following publications contained articles about SET:

• AUG 1993: Catering Industry Employee (Publication of the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union), article about SET Workplace Communications classes

• MAY 1992: HRDI Advisory, announcement and brief description of SET on the occasion of its receiving of the grant

• JUN 1993: Business Community for Effective Literacy (BCEL) final magazine described SET and other workplace projects

Information Form

Part 1: Program Parameter

1.	Target No. to be Served:	320
2.	Number Served at Each Site to Date:	
	Site #	
	1. Library of Congress:	12
	2. Department of Labor:	45
	3. Department of Interior:	4
	4. Philip Morris:	15
	5. George Washington University:	35
	6. Department of Agriculture:	5
	7. Union Hall:	99
TOTAL (students attending at least 8 hours of class)		215

3. Total Number Served

Unduplicated Count	
No attendance criterion	209
Attended at least 8 hours across classes	153
Duplicated count	
No attendance criterion	324
Attended at least 8 hours in a class	215

4. Number Participating in Programs Offered:

Basic Skills	45
Pre-GED	33
GED	68

Workplace Communications (SET 2)	28
Abbreviated Workplace Communications	15
ESL	30
Summer Sampler: Workplace Communications, Math, Writing	10
TOTAL (students attending at least 8 hours in each class)	215

5. Federal Funds Obligated: $411, 983.00

6. Matching Funds/In-Kind: $178,962.50

7. Value Release Time: not applicable

8. Contact Hours Provided: 20 - 96

Part 2: Participant Data

1. Mean Age of Participants:
   - No attendance criterion: 37 years
   - Attended at least 8 hours across classes: 37 years

2. Number Limited English Proficient: 30

3. Race/Ethnicity Numbers (no attendance criterion) 209

Euro-American	3	American Indian	0
African American	152	Alaskan Native	0
Hispanic	40	Asian	7
Other	0	African	7

4. Race/Ethnicity Numbers (attended at least 9 hours) 153

Euro-American	2	American Indian	0
African American	112	Alaskan Native	0
Hispanic	28	Asian	6
Other	0	African	5

Characteristics of SET Participants

Characteristic	Total Participants Number	Total Participants Percent (%)	Attendants Number	Attendants Percent (%)
Gender	(N=209)		(N=153)	
Male	73	35	54	35
Female	136	65	99	65
Age				
16-25 years	27	13	22	14
26-35 years	58	28	45	29
36-45 years	49	23	36	24
46-55 years	28	13	24	16
56 years or older	12	6	7	5
Unknown	35	17	19	12
Years of Education				
9 years or less	45	21	37	24
10-11 years	56	27	44	29
12 years	62	30	48	31
13 years or more	8	4	6	4
Unknown	38	18	18	12
Years Employed by Company				
4 years or less	79	38	60	39
5-10 years	33	16	23	15
11-15 years	19	9	15	10
16 years or more	24	11	21	14
Unknown	54	26	34	22